DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 901 HE 034 777

TITLE	Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis: University System of Maryland, Morgan State University.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Higher Education Commission, Annapolis.
PUB DATE	2002-01-00
NOTE	89p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.mhec.state.md.us.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; Evaluation Methods; *Financial Support; Higher Education; *Peer Institutions; *Performance Based Assessment; Resource Allocation; Selection; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Morgan State University MD; *University of Maryland System

ABSTRACT

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept is to identify funding peers that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics, and then to compare these funding peers to inform resource questions and assess performance. Each applicable Maryland institution is to select 10 performance peers from its list of funding peers. Seventeen measures have been identified for the University System of Maryland institutions and 14 for Morgan State University. These indicators are compared with the state's Managing for Results initiative. Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above the level of their performance peers on most indicators. This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution and Morgan State University in comparison with their performance peers. It includes a discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability. In addition, each institution was given the opportunity to respond to the assessment of its performance, and these responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section. Three appendixes discuss methodology for selecting performance peers and operational definitions for performance indicators for the University System and Morgan State University. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 901

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

FUNDING GUIDELINES
PEER PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

M R. Rosnthal

January 2002

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
16 Francis Street, Annapolis, Maryland 21401
www.mhec.state.md.us

HE034777

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

John J. Oliver, Jr., Chairman

Dorothy Dixon Chaney

Edward O. Clarke, Jr.

Micah Coleman

Anne Osborn Emery

John L. Green

George S. Malouf, Jr.

David S. Oros

R. Kathleen Perini

Charles B. Saunders, Jr.

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr.

Richard P. Streett, Jr.

Karen R. Johnson, J.D.
Secretary of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Background 1
Refining Funding Guidelines 1
Performance Measures 2
Assessing Institution Performance 2
Data Availability 3

Peer Performance Analysis
Bowie State University 11
Coppin State College 15
Frostburg State University 19
Salisbury University 23
Towson University 27
University of Baltimore 31
University of Maryland, Baltimore 35
University of Maryland Baltimore County 39
University of Maryland, College Park 43
University of Maryland Eastern Shore 47
University of Maryland University College 51
Morgan State University 55

Appendices
Appendix A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers 61
Appendix B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators 63
Appendix C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators 73

Tables
Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines 5
Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines 7

Executive Summary

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics. These 'funding peers' are compared to the Maryland institutions to inform resource questions and assess performance.

Included in the funding guidelines process is an annual performance accountability component. Each applicable Maryland institution selects 10 "performance peers" from their list of "funding peers." The Commission, in consultation with representatives from the University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services, identified a set of comprehensive, outcome-oriented performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. There are 17 measures for USM institutions and 14 for Morgan. These indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and include indicators for which data are currently available. In some instances, institutions added specific indicators that were more reflective of the institution's role and mission.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed the institution's performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception was made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution and Morgan State University in comparison to their performance peers. The report includes a discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability. In addition, each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section.

Background

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted funding guidelines; a peer-based model designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions (i.e. 'funding peers') that are similar to the Maryland institution (i.e. "home" institution) in mission, size, program mix, enrollment composition, and other defining characteristics. These funding peers are then compared and contrasted with the Maryland institution.

One component critical in determining whether the State's higher education institutions are performing at the level of their funding peers is performance accountability. To compare performance, the presidents of each Maryland institution (except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University) selected ten 'performance' peers from their list of 'funding' peers. The presidents based this selection on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives. The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. For the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), 'composite peers' are used to recognize UMB's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. Appendix A lists the criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

Refining Funding Guidelines

Fiscal Year 2002 was the second year that funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. For the first time, the Commission provided a report to the General Assembly on the University System of Maryland's performance relative to their performance peers. The budget committees expressed concern that this report was not comprehensive because the performance indicators did not place enough emphasis on outcome and achievement measures. The committees requested that the Commission address this gap by developing more comprehensive and outcome-oriented accountability indicators.

The Commission, in consultation with the representatives from the University System of Maryland, the Department of Budget and Management, the Department of Legislative Services and Morgan State University, established a workgroup to address the gap in the peer performance component of the funding guidelines. Based on collaborative decisions, the workgroup identified a set of performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their 'performance' peers. In addition, the workgroup developed a method to assess institutional performance.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution and Morgan State University in comparison to their performance peers. A discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability follow.

Performance Measures

For the University System of Maryland institutions, there are 17 performance measures (see Table 1). Not all institutions are required to provide data on all of the measures. There are separate sets of indicators for Maryland's comprehensive institutions and for the research universities. Furthermore, institutions have the flexibility to add specific indicators that are more reflective of their role and mission. The indicators include retention and graduation rates and outcome measures such as licensure examination passing rates, the number of faculty awards, and student and employer satisfaction rates. All indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results initiative and reflect statewide policy goals. Appendix B lists the operational definitions for each indicator.

There are 14 performance measures for Morgan State University (see Table 2). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, student and employer satisfaction rates, and the passing rate on the Praxis II examination (an assessment that measures teacher candidate's knowledge of the subjects that they will teach). Appendix C lists the operational definitions for Morgan's indicators.

Assessing Institution Performance

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed institutional performance within the context of the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative. In general, institutions were expected to make progress towards achieving their benchmarks established within the MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution is required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception will be made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

For this report, each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section of this report.

In future years, the performance component will influence the integration of aspirational peers into the funding guideline process. Institutions may be eligible for enhanced guideline funding if the institution's performance on a set of the approved indicators meets or exceeds the performance of its peers. In the coming year, the Commission will work with the public campuses, the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services to develop criteria under which an institution would be eligible for enhanced guideline funding.

Data Availability

It should be noted that it was difficult to obtain nationally comparable outcome-based performance measures. To the extent possible, the measures identified for peer comparisons use data that are verifiable and currently available from national data systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, and *U.S. News and World Report*. Although the National Center for Education Statistics is currently in the process of designing methods to gather outcome-based indicators, many of these data are not readily available. For example, peer data are not available for alumni giving, graduate satisfaction, employers' satisfaction, and passing rates on several professional licensure examinations. In cases where data are not available through national data systems, Maryland institutions obtained data either directly from their peer institutions or compared its performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification. For one measure, employers' satisfaction, USM institutions are compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions that are of the same Carnegie classification. The University of North Carolina System conducts an annual survey of employers who hire their graduates and this survey is comparable to University System of Maryland's annual survey. In the future, as more data become available, the Commission will incorporate additional outcome-based measures into the peer performance process.

It should be noted that for one measure, the pass rate on the Praxis II examination, research suggests that comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another. Since each state independently determines the level of performance required for teacher certification, this indicator is useful only for comparing institutional performance to other Maryland institutions.

In addition, there are subtle differences between the operational definitions found in this analysis and the definitions used in the MFR for several performance indicators. For example, in this analysis, the second-year retention rate and the six-year graduation rate measures the proportion of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduate students who either returned to or graduated from the same college or university. In addition, the graduation data used in this analysis are based on the Federal Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), a federal initiative that collects data required by the Student Right-to-Know Act of 1990. In contrast, the MFR captures students who re-enroll or graduate from the same institution as well as those students who transfer to any Maryland public four-year institution. Because of these subtle differences, it was not possible to assess institutional performance on retention and graduation within the context of the MFR initiative.

Despite the overall difficulties in obtaining nationally comparable performance measures, institutions were expected to take appropriate steps to collect data on all performance measures. In the analysis section of this report, institutions were asked to identify actions that they are taking to collect data.

Table 1. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSC	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students [1]	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
2. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. % African-American of all undergrads	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
5. Six year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
6. Six year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
7. Six year graduation rate: African-Am.	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
8. Pass rate on Praxis II exam	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
9. Passing rate in nursing licensing exam		•		•	•		•				
10. Passing rates in other licensure exams [2]			SW			Law	Med Law Dent SW Pharm				
11. Graduates' satisfaction [3]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Employers' satisfaction [4]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
13. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
14. Total R&D expenditures [5]							•	•	•		
15. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures [5]							•	•	•		
16. $s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty [5]							•	•	•		
17. # of faculty awards per 100 faculty							•	•	•		
18. Institution-specific measures											

[1] Institutions have the option of using the 25th and 75th percentile of SAT score for entering freshmen

[2] For some licensing examinations, overall Maryland passing rate may be the appropriate reference rather than the peer institutions

[3] Comparable peer data are not available. Data for USM institutions

[4] University of North Carolina System's schools will be used for peer comparison

[5] For institutions other than UMB, peer's medical R&D expenditures will be excluded

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES

Measure[1]	Comparision Group
1. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
2. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
4. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
7. Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	National Peers
8. Graduate professional school going rate	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
9. Satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
10. Satisfaction with job preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
11. PRAXIS II pass rate	Appropriate Maryland institutions
12. Summary measure of employer satisfaction	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
13. Alumni giving	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
14. Percent growth in grants and contracts expenditures	National Peers

[1] For all measures, the most recent data available will be used.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Peer Performance Analysis

Bowie State University

Bowie State University exceeds the performance of its peers on several performance measures. The university's second-year retention and six-year graduation rates are higher than any of its peer institutions. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution exceeds the peers' average.

There are, however, a few cases where the institution performs below the level of its peers. Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, Bowie ranks last in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the university. Furthermore, Bowie's performance on this indicator could not be assessed within the context of the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative because data for this indicator were not available.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees; acceptance rate; yield rate (enrollment rate); and research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. In terms of faculty quality, Bowie has the second highest percentage of faculty with terminal degrees and exceeds its peers' average. The university's level of expenditures for research and development per full-time faculty exceeds the peers' average and is higher than most of its peers. In this case, however, only three of its peers reported expenditures in this area. Bowie's average acceptance rate on offers of admission is 43.4 percent; a figure below the peers' average of 87.2 percent. In addition, the university's yield rate (or enrollment rate) is slightly below its peers' average.

In many cases, Commission staff was unable to compare the performance of Bowie relative to its peers due to missing data for a number of measures. For example, data for the alumni-giving category are not available for seven of Bowie's peers. Among the indicators where Bowie's performance exceeds its peers' average (e.g. graduation rate for all students, minorities and African-Americans; and the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees) data are missing from at least three institutions.

The Institution's Response

Bowie plans to improve performance on employer satisfaction by enhancing workforce skills through the implementation of two new technology initiatives. Furthermore, the institution states that the comparison of this indicator could also become more favorable when comparable institutions within the North Carolina system are included as peers. In future reports, several comprehensive institutions with similar academic offerings and student body profiles will be included. To improve the yield rate (enrollment rate), the institution expects this percentage to increase, as the quality of their educational product becomes better known.

The university has been diligent in its efforts to acquire peer data. When data were not available through national data systems or through university websites, Bowie made direct inquiries to its peer institutions. In most of these cases, institutions responded that the requested data were not collected or available and in some cases the promise to

provide data was not fulfilled. For future reports, the university will seek other possible sources for data.

Bowie State University
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)
Bowie State U	810-982	89.9%	86.1%	72.0%	34.2%	34.3%	34.3%	98%
Auburn U , Montgomery	ACT 17-22	34.5%	31.4%	57.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Augusta State U	870-1080	30.2%	24.7%	55.0%	21.6%	17.8%	16.0%	N/A
Cheyney U. of Penn	N/A	98.9%	96.8%	62.0%	26.8%	26.7%	27.1%	N/A
Columbus State U	N/A	31.6%	26.4%	62.0%	27.7%	16.7%	17.1%	N/A
Indiana U , Northwest	770-1000	36.0%	25.2%	61.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Jersey City U	N/A	56.2%	19.2%	70.0%	29.3%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prairie View A & M U	720-930	94.6%	92.3%	63.0%	32.4%	32.7%	33.1%	N/A
Sul Ross State U	ACT 15-20	58.2%	3.1%	50.0%	21.4%	24.7%	33.3%	N/A
Virginia State U	710-900	96.0%	94.7%	71.0%	29.2%	29.1%	29.4%	N/A
Western New Mexico U	ACT 16	48.2%	1.9%	51.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average of Peers		**58.4%**	**41.6%**	**60.2%**	**26.9%**	**24.6%**	**26.0%**	

	BSU institution-specific indicators					North Carolina comparisons		
University	Alumni giving rate	% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty ($000)		Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Bowie State U	3.3%	70.5%	43.4%	51.8%	$24.1	Bowie State U	93.1%	94.6%
Auburn U , Montgomery	N/A	N/A	98.9%	N/A	0.0	Western Carolina State U	96.3%	
Augusta State U	N/A	70.1%	64.3%	83.7%	0.0	Appalachian State U	99.0%	
Cheyney U. of Penn	2.4%	56.5%	77.7%	36.1%	0.0	Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
Columbus State U	11.5%	69.8%	N/A	N/A	0.0	North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
Indiana U , Northwest	N/A	65.9%	79.3%	90.2%	0.0	North Carolina Central U	94.7%	
New Jersey City U	N/A	N/A	58.4%	49.8%	0.0	UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
Prairie View A & M U	1.3%	N/A	96.0%	58.7%	110.4	UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
Sul Ross State U	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.6	UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Virginia State U	N/A	79.2%	86.9%	37.0%	16.7			
Western New Mexico U	N/A	N/A	100.0%	37.8%	0.0			
Average of Peers	**5.1%**	**68.3%**	**82.7%**	**56.2%**	**$13.4**	**Average**	**97.5%**	

Notes:

N/A - Data not available

(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement, at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Coppin State College

Compared to its peers, Coppin State College has the third highest second-year retention rate and this rate exceeds the peers' average. In addition, the percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peers' average.

The college performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Coppin ranks seventh in six-year graduation rate for all students and this rate is below its peers' average. The six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students are also well below the peers' average. In terms of the college's effectiveness in preparing nursing students, Coppin ranks third and is below the peers' average in the percentage of students passing the nursing exam. In addition, the college's performance on this indicator has not improved. According to the MFR, the proportion of students passing this exam has declined from 95 percent in 1998 to 83 percent in 2000. Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, Coppin is below average in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the college. According to the MFR, Coppin's performance on this indicator has improved; increasing from 91 percent to 95 percent. This is also the institution's benchmark for this indicator.

The college added five institution specific indicators: percent of undergraduates attending part-time; percent of graduate students enrolled; unrestricted, non-auxiliary revenue as a percent of total unrestricted revenue; the average age of full-time undergraduates; and the proportion of commuter students. Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. For example, approximately 30 percent of Coppin's student population attends part-time which is slightly higher than its peers' average. Furthermore, the average age for full-time undergraduate students is 25, slightly higher than the peers' average and compared to its peers, the vast majority of the students commute. The percentage of graduate students attending the institution is relatively low. Compared to its peers, the proportion of graduate students is slightly lower than the peers' average.

In a few cases, it is difficult for Commission staff to compare the performance of Coppin relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example, Coppin has the highest alumni-giving rate yet data are not available for eight of its peers. For the percentage of students passing the nursing exam, data are not available for five of Coppin's peer institutions. In addition, data are missing from a number of peer institutions on the six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students.

The Institution's Response

The college has implemented several retention initiatives in order to improve its six-year graduation rate for all students, all minorities, and African-American students. These initiatives include cohort-based, campus wide campaign, which is an intensive effort to contact and provide advisement and problem identification services to students in the

1996, 1997, and 1998 cohorts. These students are routinely monitored throughout the semester and academic year.

In addition, Coppin has implemented several strategies to improve the pass rate on the nursing exam. The college developed an action plan, which includes specific strategies for correction, dates for accomplishment, preparatory and remedial support for students, guidelines for student selection, and changes in academic hours. Furthermore, Coppin's Division of Nursing now requires a full-time faculty team leader for senior medical-surgical nursing. The college has decreased the number of adjunct faculty and adjusted full-time faculty teaching loads to meet student needs. The college has implemented several other strategies including using computer assisted practice tests to aid preparation for the comprehensive exam and Nursing Student Enrichment Specialists to assist senior students test preparation.

The college has made a number of efforts to acquire peer data. For the alumni-giving rate, the national database used to collect data on alumni giving did not receive reports from many of Coppin's peer institutions. However, in the future, Coppin will contact individual offices at its peer institutions for these data. In addition, the college worked diligently to collect data directly from its peers regarding the six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students. In many cases, institutions promised to provide data but never followed-up on this promise or Coppin was unable to get anyone to commit to follow-up with their request.

Coppin State College
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
Coppin State College	929	96.4%	95.3%	71.0%	17.4%	18.3%	18.7%	100.0%	83.0%
Alabama State U	ACT 13-18	94.0%	93.4%	57.0%	23.4%	23.6%	23.7%	N/R	N/A
Alcorn State U	ACT 16-19	96.3%	96.2%	72.0%	46.7%	46.3%	46.5%	100.0%	100.0%
Columbus State U	N/A	31.6%	26.4%	62.0%	27.7%	16.7%	17.1%	N/R	100.0%
Fort Valley State U	N/A	95.6%	95.0%	77.0%	15.0%	15.2%	12.2%	N/A	N/A
New Jersey City U	N/A	56.2%	19.2%	70.0%	29.3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Mexico Highlands U	ACT 16-21	76.0%	2.8%	54.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.0%	N/A
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	920-1030	44.5%	17.6%	70.0%	36.9%	37.7%	42.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Sul Ross State U	ACT 15-20	58.2%	3.1%	50.0%	21.4%	24.7%	33.3%	87.0%	will start Fall 2002
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	890-1100	44.5%	2.9%	65.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.0%	76.6%
Western New Mexico U	ACT 16	48.2%	1.9%	51.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	***	88.0%
Average of Peers		**64.5%**	**35.9%**	**62.8%**	**28.6%**	**27.4%**	**29.2%**	**93.4%**	**92.9%**

		CSC institution-specific indicators					North Carolina comparisons		
University	Alumni giving rate	Part-time undergrads as % of total hdct.	Graduate students as % of total headcount	Unrestr. non-auxiliary revenue as % of total unrestr. revenue	Average age full-time undergraduate	% Commuter students		Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Coppin State C	30.1%	30.1%	16.4%	86.5%	25	90%	Coppin State C	95%	94.9%
Alabama State U	N/A	13.9%	17.3%	83.4%	19	57%	Western Carolina State U	96.3%	
Alcorn State U	N/A	6.7%	16.3%	85.9%	21	21%	Appalachian State U	99.0%	
Columbus State U	11.5%	38.9%	12.9%	95.4%	26	40%	Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
Fort Valley State U	N/A	9.7%	12.0%	82.0%	24	31%	North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
New Jersey City U	N/A	36.9%	25.8%	95.1%	25	95%	North Carolina Central U	94.7%	
New Mexico Highlands U	N/A	20.9%	39.2%	92.6%	25	N/A	UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	N/A	22.1%	8.9%	79.8%	25	77%	UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
Sul Ross State U	N/A	34.9%	31.5%	92.3%	21	66%	UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	4.8%	29.0%	23.8%	93.9%	25	90%			
Western New Mexico U	N/A	34.8%	21.2%	94.0%	25	N/A			
Average of Peers	**8.2%**	**24.8%**	**20.9%**	**89.4%**	**23.6**	**59.6%**	**Average**	**97.5%**	

N/A - Data not available
N/R - Praxis II not required
*** Less than 10 test takers, no data given
(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University's performance on a number of performance indicators meets or exceeds its peers' average. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peers' average. In addition, the university has the third highest six-year graduation rate for all minorities and the fourth highest six-year graduation rate for African-American students. In both cases, Frostburg's performance on these indicators exceeds its peers' average. It should be noted that compared to its peers, Frostburg State University enrolls students with lower SAT scores.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, Frostburg's performance is above its peers' average in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the institution. In addition, according to the MFR, the university's performance on this indicator has improved; increasing from 65 percent in 1999 to 98 percent in 2001. This is also the institution's benchmark for this indicator. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, Frostburg performs at the average of its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Frostburg ranks seventh in the second-year retention rate for all students and sixth in the six-year graduation rate. In both cases, the university performs slightly below its peers' average.

In terms of the institution's effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates and social workers, Frostburg ranks first among its peers on the percentage of students passing the Praxis II exam and reports a 100 percent passing rate on the social work licensing exam.

Frostburg added two institution-specific indicators: student-faculty ratio and educational and general (E&G) expenditures per degree awarded. The university's student-faculty ratio equals its peers' average. However, Frostburg receives a lower level of resources than its peers. The university has the lowest E&G expenditures per degree awarded and is substantially below its peers' average.

On professional licensure examinations, Frostburg has a high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam. Many of Frostburg's peer institutions however use alternative certification tests. It was difficult to assess Frostburg's performance on the social work exam because of missing data from its peer institutions. Although Frostburg has the highest proportion of students passing the social work licensing exam, data are not available from most of its peer institutions nor is historical data provided in the institution's MFR.

The Institution's Response

To improve the second-year retention and six-year graduation rate, Frostburg has implemented and published an admissions matrix as part of its recruitment process. This action is intended to recruit students who represent the best fit to be successful and possess the highest probability for retention. Furthermore, more scholarship funds are

being awarded to attract and retain students. The university notes that the graduation rate will return to its customary level once Frostburg recovers from a one-year drop in second-year retention that occurred in 1994.

With regards to the need to collect peer data on the social work licensure exam, Frostburg notes that of its current peers, those institutions that offer an undergraduate Social Work (BSW) program do not require completion of licensing examinations. In some states, eligibility to complete Social Work licensing examinations requires the Master's in Social Work (MSW); therefore, these BSW programs will not have data on their undergraduate programs. Furthermore, Frostburg notes that many institutions continue to be reticent about disclosing the performance of their graduates. The university however, receives annual reports from the Association of Social Work Boards, which provides the average national pass rate. Below is a comparison of Frostburg's performance on this exam and the national average.

Passing Rate in Nursing Licensing Exam: FY 1998 to FY 2000

Pass Rate	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
National	83	83	79
FSU	100	100	100

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Frostburg State University
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Passing rate in BSW social work licensing exam (4)	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
Frostburg State U	870-1080	15.2%	11.3%	72.0%	49.8%	40.6%	43.5%	92.0%	100.0%	16%
California U. of Penn	850-1030	5.3%	4.1%	69.0%	43.0%	39.1%	43.8%	83.0%	N/A	12%
Clarion U. of Penn	N/A	5.4%	4.3%	73.0%	51.9%	33.3%	31.3%	81.0%	N/A	13%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn	860-1050	7.6%	3.5%	73.0%	50.8%	33.9%	25.8%	86.0%	N/A	21%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	950-1150	10.2%	5.4%	78.0%	43.7%	31.3%	25.5%	note 1	N/A	20%
Sonoma State U	930-1140	18.1%	2.0%	77.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	note 2	N/A	5%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	950-1110	9.5%	3.3%	63.0%	44.8%	28.6%	25.0%	note 3	N/A	15%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	970-1140	8.0%	2.8%	79.0%	57.4%	39.5%	33.3%	note 3	N/A	15%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	930-1140	7.9%	3.0%	75.0%	74.9%	56.0%	50.0%	note 3	N/A	17%
Western Connecticut State U	830-1060	14.6%	5.6%	65.0%	41.6%	27.2%	22.7%	88.0%	N/A	N/A
Winthrop U	940-1130	26.1%	23.8%	76.0%	55.2%	55.2%	56.7%	92.0%	N/A	22%
Average of Peers		**11.3%**	**5.8%**	**72.8%**	**51.5%**	**38.2%**	**34.9%**	**86.0%**		**16%**

	FSU institution-specific indicators		North Carolina comparisons		
University	Ratio of FTES to FT faculty	E&G expenditure per degree awarded		Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Frostburg State U	21	$9,264	Frostburg State U (5)	98%	86%
California U. of Penn	18	11,779	Western Carolina State U	96.3%	
Clarion U. of Penn	20	10,317	Appalachian State U	99.0%	
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn	21	10,954	Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	19	13,724	North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
Sonoma State U	25	14,419	North Carolina Central U	94.7%	
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	30	10,937	UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	22	10,851	UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	18	12,384	UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Western Connecticut State U	22	10,069			
Winthrop U	19	9,565			
Average of Peers	21	$11,500	Average	97.8%	

Notes:

N/A - Data not available

(1) Teacher certification test is Mass. Teacher Test. Passing rate = 61%

(2) Teacher certification test is Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)

(3) Teacher certification test is Liberal Arts & Science Test & Assessment of Teaching Skills Written (NES). Passing rates: SUNY, Oneonta = 99%, SUNY, Plattsburgh = 99%, SUNY, Potsdam = 99%.

(4) Passing rates for peers are not available from any of the following sources all of which were contacted: peers, state social work organizations, and the national social work organization. This applies to BSW graduates.

(5) BS, BA, & BEA recipients

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds the performance of its peers on almost every performance indicator. The university attracts highly qualified, new freshmen ranking second among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and first for the 75th percentile. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, Salisbury performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. The university has the highest second-year retention rate for all students and the highest six-year graduation rate for minority students. Salisbury ranks second in the six-year graduation rate for all students and for African-American students.

In terms of the institution's effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates and nursing students, the university has high passing rates on several licensure examinations. Salisbury's passing rate on the Praxis II exam is the highest among the institutions reporting pass rates for this teaching examination. The university reports a 90 percent passing rate on nursing licensing examination; a rate that exceeds the peers' average of 87 percent.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, Salisbury is slightly above its peers' average in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the university. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, Salisbury is above the average of its peers on this indicator.

Salisbury selected five institution-specific indicators: acceptance rate; percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first-professional or other terminal degree; student-faculty ratio; average high school grade point average of first-time freshmen; and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student. Compared to its peers, Salisbury is more selective. The university's acceptance rate is 57 percent compared to its peers' average of 86 percent. Salisbury's focus on enrolling high quality students is also evidenced by the average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen. For the entering class, the average high school GPA is 3.4, which is above the peers' average of 3.22. In addition, Salisbury's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In terms of faculty quality, Salisbury performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. Only 76 percent of Salisbury's faculty has earned a terminal degree compared to its peers' average of 86 percent. In addition, Salisbury receives the second lowest state appropriation per full-time equivalent students; a level that is well below the peers' average.

On professional licensure examinations, Salisbury has a high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam. Many of Salisbury's peer institutions however use alternative certification tests. On the nursing licensing exam, it was difficult to assess Salisbury's performance due to missing data from its peer institutions. For the nursing exam, four of its peer institutions do not have a nursing program and data are not available for three of the institutions.

The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to increase the number of faculty with terminal degrees. In order to keep pace with burgeoning enrollments and the concurrent impact of diminishing its reliance upon contractual faculty, Salisbury plans to add 35 new tenure-track faculty positions between FY 2002 and FY 2004, all of which require terminal qualifications. It is important to note that the peer measure referenced in this analysis includes *all* full-time faculty, which includes full-time contractual faculty, and which consequently lowers the overall percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. In fact, although 76 percent of all full-time faculty have terminal degrees, Salisbury reports that 90 percent of its full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty earned terminal degrees.

Although Salisbury recognizes and values the extremely generous support it has received over the past few years, when compared against institutional peers the funding deficiencies remain significant. This places the university in a position where it receives state appropriations that are fully $1,697 per full-time equivalent student below the peer funding average. Salisbury notes that since state appropriations remain paramount for any significant progress to occur in attracting and retaining additional highly qualified faculty, state funding to guideline levels is a prerequisite.

Regarding the collection of peer data, these complexities are compounded at the university level where each peer institution must be contacted separately—a process complicated further by requests from other institutions and agencies that threaten to inundate university offices. To enhance peer data collection, the university is investigating consortia data exchange agreements, and involving various campus departments, particularly those in Nursing and Education, to assist with the data collection from colleagues at peer institutions. Additionally, the institution is considering the employment of an additional full-time staff member to focus exclusively on the collection, verification, analyses, and update of data used in accountability reports, peer comparisons, MFR, minority achievement reports, Title II, assessment, and accreditation reporting.

Salisbury University
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4 yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam[2]
Salisbury U.	1030-1200	10.4%	7.7%	83.0%	61.2%	51.4%	50.0%	96%	90%
Central Washington U.	880-1080	12.7%	2.0%	74.0%	45.3%	43.3%	30.8%	pending	no nursing prog
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	950-1150	10.2%	5.4%	78.0%	43.7%	31.3%	25.5%	61%	96%[3]
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1000-1160	8.7%	5.3%	79.0%	59.8%	51.1%	52.9%	note [1]	79%
Shippensburg U. of Penn	960-1150	5.8%	3.5%	77.0%	63.6%	40.8%	31.8%	note [1]	no nursing prog
Sonoma State U.	930-1140	18.1%	2.0%	77.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A - not required	pending
Southeast Missouri State U.	ACT 19-25	6.6%	4.5%	71.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	pending	pending
SUNY, C. at Oswego	1040-1190	8.4%	3.7%	80.0%	57.5%	46.1%	37.7%	94%	no nursing prog
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	970-1140	8.0%	2.8%	79.0%	57.4%	39.5%	33.3%	pending	pending
Western Carolina U.	890-1090	8.5%	5.1%	69.0%	47.1%	44.4%	46.0%	note [1]	87%
Western Oregon U.	N/A	9.8%	1.2%	72.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	pending	no nursing prog
Average of Peers		9.7%	**3.6%**	**75.6%**	**53.5%**	**42.4%**	**36.9%**	**78%**	**83%**

University	Alumni giving rate	SU institution-specific indicators: Acceptance rate	% of faculty with terminal degrees	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	Average HS GPA	Total state appropriation/FTES
Salisbury U.	18.6%	57%	76%	17.1	3.40	$4,305
Central Washington U.	N/A	83%	84%	20.2	3.10	5,172
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	N/A	65%	86%	15.2	2.92	8,188
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	14.7%	58%	87%	20.9	3.48	6,078
Shippensburg U. of Penn	30.5%	64%	90%	17.8	N/A	4,798
Sonoma State U.	1.5%	81%	100%	18.9	3.23	7,644
Southeast Missouri State U.	5.9%	94%	80%	17.9	3.20	6,607
SUNY, C. at Oswego	26.4%	56%	76%	18.7	3.10	4,396
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	15.6%	69%	87%	17.3	3.50	4,786
Western Carolina U.	27.3%	82%	80%	19.3	3.14	8,906
Western Oregon U.	N/A	93%	86%	13.5	3.30	3,448
Average of Peers	**17.4%**	**75%**	**86%**	**18.0**	**3.22**	**$6,002**

North Carolina comparisons	Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Salisbury U.	97.8%	**88.3%**
Western Carolina Stat	96.3%	
Appalachian State U	99.0%	
Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
North Carolina Centr	94.7%	
UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Average	97.5%	

Notes:

N/A - Data not available

(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement, at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

(1) In the absence of PRAXIS II and or NTE summary totals and pass rates, Elementary Education pass rates are provided. North Carolina, Wilmington = 97%, Shippensburg = 96%, Western Carolina = 95%

(2) Praxis II and Nursing exam passing rates above were obtained by SU's Education and Nursing Departments respectively from the corresponding departments at SU peer institutions. Given the shortened time frame, some data are incomplete but responses are pending.

(3) Estimate from the Dean of Nursing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

29

Towson University

Towson University compares favorably to its peers on the vast majority of its performance indicators. The university ranks second among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and the 75th percentile. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, Towson performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rate. The university has the second highest retention and graduation rates among its peers. In terms of Towson's effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates and nursing students, the university's passing rate on the nursing exam is slightly above the peers' average.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, Towson ranks first among its peers in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the university. The university also compares favorably in the undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Towson is above the average of its peers on this indicator.

The university performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of minorities enrolled as undergraduate students. However, according to the MFR, this percentage has increased over the last few years; from 14.4 percent in 1998 to 15.3 percent in 2000. Furthermore, a closer analysis of Towson's peer institutions reveals that five of these institutions enroll a high proportion of Hispanic students.

Towson selected four institution-specific indicators: average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen; percent of undergraduates who live on campus; student-faculty ratio; and acceptance rate. In terms of freshmen quality, the average high school GPA is 3.2, which is below the peers' average of 3.30. In addition, Towson's peer institutions are more selective. The university reports an acceptance rate of 69 percent – a level slightly above its peers' average. In addition, roughly a quarter of Towson's undergraduate students reside on campus and Towson's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In some cases, Commission staff was unable to assess Towson's performance relative to its peers because of missing data. For example, it was difficult to assess Towson performance on the Praxis II. On this exam, data was not provided for Towson. In addition, data on the average high school grade point average for incoming students are not provided for four of Towson's peers.

The Institution's Response

Towson chose characteristics that are highly correlated with retention and graduation and that are important to the University's strategic planning. Towson is committed to improving retention and graduation rates. A review of national data suggests that that institutions with high graduation rates have higher entering high school grade point averages, higher percentages of undergraduates living on campus, lower student faculty ratios, and lower percentages admitted compared with institutions with lower graduation rates.

In addition, research suggests that high school grade point average is a far more valuable predictor of retention and graduation than is the SAT score. For that reason, the university is emphasizing high school grade point averages over SAT scores in the admission decision process. As a result, the high school grade point average for entering freshmen increased from 3.20 in 1999 to 3.43 in 2001.

The university uses the Common Data Set (CDS) as the source of data on high school grade point average for entering students. This is one of the most reliable methods of obtaining peer data. The formation of the CDS was a collaborative effort among the higher education community with the goal to improve the quality and accuracy of information provided to external constituencies. Standard data items and definitions are provided and institutions are encouraged to post the CDS to their website. Completion of the CDS is voluntary, however, and some of Towson's peer institutions omitted this information from their submissions. In the future, if the institution is unable to obtain sufficient data in the future, Towson plans to consult other resources.

Towson University
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
Towson U	980-1160	15.3%	10.4%	82.0%	56.4%	42.4%	43.6%	97.0%	86.0%
California State U., Fresno	800-1060	46.3%	5.6%	82.0%	40.7%	33.4%	23.8%	N/A	87.5%
California State U., Northridge	675-996	48.1%	8.5%	76.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85.3%
California State U., Sacramento	840-1120	39.1%	6.6%	77.0%	37.5%	33.3%	24.2%	N/A	89.0%
Montclair State C	880-1100	31.0%	10.6%	84.0%	53.6%	39.5%	36.1%	N/A	No nursing program
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	930-1130	24.7%	17.8%	77.0%	49.6%	43.7%	42.0%	N/A	83.0%
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1000-1160	8.7%	5.3%	79.0%	59.8%	51.1%	52.9%	N/A	79.0%
Southwest Texas State U	940-1120	26.5%	5.0%	68.0%	38.9%	35.3%	39.0%	N/A	No nursing program
SUNY, Buffalo State C	860-1060	16.5%	11.4%	70.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No nursing program
Western Illinois U	ACT 19-24	10.8%	6.7%	72.0%	43.2%	31.0%	27.6%	Exam not used	No nursing program
Western Kentucky U	ACT 18-24	9.6%	7.7%	70.0%	37.1%	29.3%	28.6%	N/A	88.0%
Average of Peers		**26.1%**	**8.5%**	**75.5%**	**45.1%**	**37.1%**	**34.3%**		**85.3%**

	Towson institution-specific indicators					North Carolina comparisons		
University	Alumni giving rate	Average High School GPA	% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)		Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Towson U	13.6%	3.20	25%	16:1	69%	Towson U	100%	80.3%
California State U., Fresno	5.1%	3.23	5%	17:1	66%	Western Carolina State U	96.3%	
California State U., Northridge	2.9%	3.07	10%	21:1	80%	Appalachian State U	99.0%	
California State U., Sacramento	10.5%	N/A	N/A	21:1	41%	Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
Montclair State C	12.3%	N/A	20%	17:1	49%	North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	9.6%	3.43	27%	16:1	70%	North Carolina Central U	94.7%	
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	14.7%	3.48	23%	18:1	58%	UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
Southwest Texas State U	10.7%	3.53	22%	24:1	67%	UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
SUNY, Buffalo State C	N/A	N/A	17%	19:1	60%	UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Western Illinois U	18.5%	N/A	52%	15:1	66%			
Western Kentucky U	16.0%	3.08	33%	18:1	85%			
Average of Peers	**11.1%**	**3.30**	**23%**	**18:1**	**64%**	Average	97.5%	

Notes:

N/A - Data not available

(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement; at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Baltimore

Due to the University of Baltimore's mission to provide upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional degrees, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen. Overall, the university exceeds the performance of its peers on every indicator. The percentage of African-American and minority undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. In addition, the university is strong in the number of awards per full-time instructional faculty. The university reports a 67 percent passing rate on the law-licensing exam: a level equal to the pass rate for the only other peer institution with a law school, the University of Arkansas, Little Rock.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, UB ranks first among its peers in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the university. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, the institution exceeds the average of its peers on this indicator. It should be noted however, that only three of the peer institutions provide data for alumni giving.

The university selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. For both of these indicators, the university's performance exceeds its peers' average. UB reports the third highest expenditures for research and ranks fourth in the percentage of faculty employed part-time.

For two indicators, it was difficult to assess UB's performance due to missing data. Although the university has a high alumni-giving rate, data are missing for seven of its peers. In addition, for the number of awards per full-time faculty, data are not provided for three of its peer institutions.

The Institution's Response

Data for the number of awards per full-time faculty come from a USM database built from national publications and databases. The data are missing for three institutions because for the last several years, these schools have not completed the AAUP Faculty Compensation Survey. Data on the alumni-giving rate come from the Council for Aid to Education, 2000 Voluntary Support of Education. In the future, the university will seek an alternative source for both of these data.

University of Baltimore
Peer Performance Data

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in LAW licensing exam	Alumni giving rate	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)
Baltimore, U of	33.7%	28.7%	67.0%	21.3%	2.80
Arkansas, U of, Little Rock	N/A	N/A	67.0%	2.8%	1.01
California State U., Bakersfield	43.8%	6.5%	no law school	6.0%	2.01
Governors State U	33.7%	27.7%	no law school	N/A	N/A
Houston, U of, Clear Lake	28.0%	7.2%	no law school	N/A	0.64
Illinois, U of, Springfield	10.4%	7.5%	no law school	N/A	1.36
Indiana U., Northwest	36.0%	25.2%	no law school	N/A	N/A
New Jersey City U	56.2%	19.2%	no law school	N/A	0.83
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C	12.6%	5.3%	no law school	N/A	N/A
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	44.5%	2.9%	no law school	4.8%	0.52
Wisconsin, U of, Whitewater	6.8%	3.5%	no law school	N/A	1.99
Average of Peers	**30.2%**	**11.7%**	**67.0%**	**4.5%**	**1.19**

	UB institution-specific indicators		North Carolina comparisons	
University	Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty		Employers' satisfaction
Baltimore, U of	$2,774,502	53.5%	Baltimore, U of	100%
Arkansas, U of, Little Rock	6,859,380	N/A	Western Carolina State U	96.3%
California State U., Bakersfield	-	39.9%	Appalachian State U	99.0%
Governors State U	59,695	53.8%	Fayetteville State U	98.3%
Houston, U of, Clear Lake	6,233,442	60.0%	North Carolina A&T U	96.3%
Illinois, U of, Springfield	179,437	34.7%	North Carolina Central U	94.7%
Indiana U., Northwest	26,456	51.5%	UNC - Charlotte	97.8%
New Jersey City U.	59,866	53.9%	UNC - Pembroke	98.7%
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C	2,625,635	44.8%	UNC - Wilmington	99.0%
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	1,613,559	18.9%		
Wisconsin, U of, Whitewater	313,326	16.9%		
Average of Peers	**$1,996,755**	**41.6%**	**Average**	**97.5%**

Notes:
N/A - Data not available
Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Maryland, Baltimore

The University of Maryland, Baltimore's (UMB) peer institutions reflect the university's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Compared to its peer institutions, the university shows a wide range of performance. The university's unique structure permits only a few generalizations.

The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peers' average. The university's performance against its peers in the level of research and development (R&D) expenditures is mixed. The institution has the highest total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty but ranks last in total R&D expenditures and in total R&D medical spending. Compared to its peers, UMB has the lowest number of awards per full-time faculty. Furthermore, the university's average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures exceeds its peers' average.

In terms of the university's effectiveness in preparing health and law students, UMB has the second highest medical licensure exam pass rate and performs at a level that is equal to its peers' average. However, the university performs below the average of its peers in the pass rate for the nursing and law examinations. Although the institution's performance on the nursing exam is below its peers' average, the percentage of students passing this examination has improved over the last few years. According to the MFR, the proportion of nursing students passing the nursing examination increased from 82 percent in 1998 to 85 percent in 2000. In addition, UMB's performance on the bar exam is well below the average of its peer institutions and below the performance of students attending the University of Connecticut, the University of Texas, Austin and the University of Virginia. According to the MFR however, the university continues to show improvement on this indicator. UMB's performance on this exam has increased from 69 percent in 1998 to 79 percent in 2000. For the university's effectiveness in training social workers, the university reports an 87 percent pass rate on the social work exam.

The university selected six institution-specific indicators: total medicine R&D expenditures; medicine research grants per basic research faculty; medicine research grants per clinical faculty; percent of minority students enrolled; total headcount enrollment; and percentage of graduate and professional students enrolled. These data show that UMB's school of medicine has the second highest level of research grants per basic research faculty and the third highest level of research grants per clinical faculty. Although the remaining institution-specific indicators are primarily descriptive indicators, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. Compared to its peers, UMB has the second lowest total headcount enrollment and ranks second in the percentage of graduate and professional students enrollment. In addition, the percent of minorities of total enrollment is below the peers' average.

Peer data are not available to compare UMB's performance on both social work and dental examinations. Although UMB has a high pass rate on the medical exam, peer data are not available for three of the peer institutions.

The Institution's Response

The university has implemented several actions to improve the proportion of minorities enrolled and total medicine R&D spending. UMB is committed to demonstrating responsiveness to the State's critical need for health and human services professionals by increasing access to professional careers. To meet this goal, UMB's stated objective is to increase the number of nursing and pharmacy graduates by 30 percent between 2001 and 2005. Over the past year, UMB increased enrollments in undergraduate nursing and entry-level PharmD programs by 12 percent and 9 percent, respectively. Attaining this goal will increase the percent of minorities of total enrollment, as 55 percent of entry-level PharmD students and 36 percent of undergraduate nursing students identify themselves as minority.

A new research facility, scheduled to open in December 2002, will address significant deficiencies in research space for programs in medicine and pharmacy, increasing the productivity of existing faculty and serving as an important tool in the recruitment of leading researchers. Additional research facilities are planned to further expand and improve UMB's inventory of research space, assuring continued improvement in attaining grants from federal, state, and private sources.

In terms of the number of awards per faculty, UMB suggests omitting this indicator. Due to the specialized nature and limited scope of degree programs at UMB, the majority of UMB faculty is not eligible for the awards encompassed by the indicator of awards per full-time faculty.

The university has taken a number of actions to improve peer data collection for medical, social work, and dental licensure examinations. UMB states that these data are not available through national sources. The UMB professional schools individually contacted their respective peers in an effort to obtain this information. Three of the medical schools, one of the social work schools, and all of the dental schools declined to provide data on licensure exam passage rates. In addition, even if the data were made available to UMB, comparisons among the peer dental schools are not valid, because all but one uses a different examining agency.

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Peer Performance Data

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in other licensure exams: Nursing	Medical	Law	Dental	Social Work	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	31.1%	22.3%	85%	94%	79%		87%	14.9%	$140,903	$259,490	8.3%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	30.6%	26.9%	92%	92%	no law school		Data requested	10.9%	232,115	204,868	13.5%
California, U. of, San Francisco	27.5%	4.1%	N/A	96%	no law school		No social work prog	22.8%	417,095	N/A	1.9%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	49.7%	9.8%	94%	N/A	no law school		Data requested	N/A	175,093	134,791	10.3%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	24.4%	8.1%	83%	N/A	90%		See note 1	17.4%	508,619	230,876	5.3%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	18.0%	11.1%	92%	N/A	86%		Data requested	27.3%	252,767	152,729	4.5%
Connecticut, U. of	[redacted]				87%	[redacted]					
Texas, U. of, Austin					94%						
Virginia, U. of					97%						
Average of Peers	30.0%	11.4%	90%	94%	91%			19.6%	$317,138	$180,816	7.1%

University	Awards per 100 F.T. faculty (5 yrs.)	UMB institution specific indicators: Total medicine R&D spending	Medicine research grants per Basic Res. faculty	Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount enrollment	Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headct.	North Carolina comparisons: Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	1.31	$101.5	$161,008	$91,397	28.7%	5,553	86.4%	100%	77%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	2.70	126.8	138,843	110,967	26.5%	15,098	31.0%	[redacted]	
California, U. of, San Francisco	1.83	280.2	574,555	190,634	46.6%	3,491	97.4%		
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	4.35	N/A	68,350	29,391	42.4%	24,610	34.3%		
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	5.65	118.4	134,289	67,447	22.2%	37,846	35.3%		
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	5.89	111.7	139,295	46,690	16.9%	24,653	37.4%	99.4%	
Average of Peers	3.68	$159.3	$211,066	$81,026	30.9%	21,140	47.1%		

Notes:

N/A - Data not available

Note 1: 1999 data not available. Exam changed between 1998 and 1999 so that 1998 data are not comparable to 1999 data for UMB

Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers.

The following universities are added for comparison with bar passing rates only: Connecticut, Texas, Austin, and Virginia

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Maryland Baltimore County

The University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) exceeds the performance of its peers on the majority of its indicators. In terms of quality of new freshmen, the University ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and second for the 75th percentile. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peers' average. Furthermore, the university's second-year retention rate and six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students exceeds the peers' average. In terms of faculty quality and research, the university ranks second in the total number of awards per full-time instructional faculty and over the last five years, had the highest average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures.

The university however, performs below the average of its peers on several of performance measures. For the six-year graduation rate, UMBC is slightly below the average of its peers. The university ranks last in the total amount of research and development expenditures received from federal, state, industry and other sources. In addition, UMBC ranks last in total research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. In both instances, the university falls well below the average of its peers on these indicators. According to the MFR however, total R&D expenditures have increased substantially over the last few years; from $18 million in 1998 to $26 million in 2000.

UMBC has the lowest percentage of alumni giving among its peers. The university's 7.4 percent alumni giving rate is substantially lower than its peers' average. According to the MFR, the university's performance on this indicator has declined from 10 percent in 1998 to 7 percent in 2000. The institution however, anticipates that the alumni-giving rate will increase to 9 percent in 2001.

The university selected three institution-specific indicators: rank in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology; rank in the ratio of invention disclosures to million in R&D expenditures; and student-to-faculty ratio. Among the university's institution specific indicators, UMBC ranks first in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology and ranks first in the ratio of invention disclosures to research and development expenditures. In addition, the university has the third highest student-to-faculty ratio. According to the MFR, the student-to-faculty ratio has increased slightly since 1998.

The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to try to understand and improve the graduation rate. A telephone drop-out survey conducted late Spring 2001 revealed that the primary reason students (who had matriculated as first-time freshmen) leave UMBC within the first two years is because the major they wanted is not available. Compared to the average of UMBC's peers, the campus awards bachelor's degrees in fewer than half the number of majors (27 compared to 67). For example, UMBC is the only campus among its peers that does not offer a business program, one of the most popular majors for undergraduates nationwide. UMBC has proposed and plans to continue to propose,

new undergraduate programs in selected mission-related areas to increase the breadth of majors offered.

Nationally, research suggests that living on campus and being involved in campus activities are positively related to retention and graduation rates. In the last three years, UMBC has added 750 beds to its residence hall complex, increasing the percentage of freshmen living on campus from 60 percent to 70 percent. Additional planned initiatives, such as learning-living communities and an enhanced first- year experience program, are designed to enhance student engagement beyond the classroom. The new Campus Commons building, scheduled to open in January 2002, will facilitate campus efforts to increase student activity and event programs. Obviously, it will take several years for these initiatives to positively impact UMBC's six-year graduation rate.

For the alumni-giving rate, the number of donors and the dollars donated has increased substantially since FY 1998. UMBC is a young institution and, until recently, campus efforts in this area have focused more on maximizing funds through corporate and foundation philanthropy rather than through alumni giving. Actions taken to improve performance include: outsourcing the phonathon to reach a greater percentage of alumni, increasing direct mail communication with targeted donor segments and data research to refine alumni contact information.

The university has made efforts to improve its student-faculty ratio. However, attrition of faculty through retirement and death has increased the challenge. UMBC has identified increasing the number of full-time faculty (and lowering the ratio of students to faculty) as a top planning priority.

University of Maryland Baltimore County
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Alumni giving rate
UMBC	1060-1270	35.6%	16.0%	84.0%	50.1%	53.2%	56.1%	95.0	7.4%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	ACT 21-27	12.6%	6.5%	76.0%	45.3%	30.4%	26.3%	85.0	17.2%
California, U. of, Riverside	920-1190	67.4%	5.4%	86.0%	66.0%	65.2%	58.5%	N/A	44.8%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1040-1280	29.9%	2.2%	85.0%	67.7%	61.2%	53.7%	N/A	50.3%
Clemson U.	1060-1260	10.2%	7.8%	83.0%	71.8%	64.5%	66.2%	N/A	17.4%
Delaware, U. of	1040-1240	11.6%	6.2%	86.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.6%
Mississippi State U.	ACT 19-27	20.3%	17.8%	78.0%	49.6%	38.2%	35.7%	99.0	10.9%
Oklahoma State U., Main	ACT 21-27	14.3%	3.3%	81.0%	50.7%	45.7%	26.3%	N/A	11.7%
Rhode Island, U. of	990-1190	11.4%	3.8%	77.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.7%
SUNY, Albany	1020-1210	22.5%	8.9%	84.0%	61.7%	56.5%	53.3%	99.4	38.5%
Wyoming, U. of	ACT 21-26	6.8%	1.1%	75.0%	48.8%	37.5%	33.3%	N/A	18.0%
Average of Peers		**20.7%**	**6.3%**	**81.1%**	**57.7%**	**49.9%**	**44.2%**	**94.5**	**24.4%**

University	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UMBC institution-specific indicators: Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to $million R&D expenditures	Ratio of FTE students/ F-T faculty	North Carolina comparisons	Employers' satisfaction
UMBC	$21,854	$63,162	31.4%	4.16	1st	1st	24.6	UMBC	100%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	61,585	180,601	-0.2%	1.72	2nd	5th	19.1	North Carolina State U	98.0%
California, U. of, Riverside	75,142	167,354	-2.6%	3.35	10th	3rd	22.8	UNC - Chapel Hill	99.4%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	52,902	132,255	1.1%	6.15	7th	N/A	26.9		
Clemson U.	98,573	121,695	2.6%	1.67	3rd	7th	18.5		
Delaware, U. of	73,521	81,060	6.4%	2.73	6th	4th	20.3		
Mississippi State U.	104,445	145,063	7.2%	1.33	4th	6th	18.0		Graduates' satisfaction
Oklahoma State U., Main	79,280	97,515	2.6%	1.69	5th	6th	21.4		
Rhode Island, U. of	44,452	72,753	1.4%	1.44	11th	2nd	18.7		
SUNY, Albany	64,278	125,789	8.4%	2.70	8th	5th	27.8	UMBC	84%
Wyoming, U. of	45,958	86,713	5.6%	3.16	9th	N/A	17.5	North Carolina State U	[redacted]
								UNC - Chapel Hill	
Average of Peers	**$70,014**	**$121,080**	**3.3%**	**2.59**			**21.1**		

Notes:
N/A - Data not available
(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Maryland, College Park

The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Therefore, College Park is not yet performing at their level on many indicators. The university is below its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. According to the MFR, College Park's goal is to increase the proportion of minority undergraduate students to 35 percent. However, this proportion has declined since 1998. It should be noted however, that the percentage of minorities enrolled at College Park is higher than the non-California institutions and the university has the highest percentage of African American undergraduate students enrolled.

Compared to its peers, the university has the lowest retention and graduation rates. College Park has the lowest percentage of alumni giving among its peers. The university's 13 percent alumni-giving rate is slightly below its peers' average. According to the MFR however, the number of annual alumni donors has increased 19 percent between 1998 and 2000. In addition, the university anticipates that the number of alumni donors will continue to increase.

As an indication of the quality of the university's research efforts, College Park performs well compared to its peers in research and development (R&D) expenditures. The total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty exceed its peers' average. In addition, the university ranks first in the annual percent growth of federal R&D expenditures. Although College Park's total R&D expenditures are slightly below the peers' average, this level is higher than R&D expenditures at Chapel Hill and UCLA. As reported in the MFR, the university's total R&D expenditures increased 19 percent between 1998 and 2000.

College Park added four institution-specific indicators: the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation; the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation; the percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies; and the number of invention disclosures reported per $100 million in total research and development expenditures. Although College Park ranks last in both the number of graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 and among the top 15 in the nation, the university has improved. As reported in the MFR, the number of programs ranked among the top 25 and the top 15 have increased substantially over the last few years. Furthermore, the university is well on its way to achieving its MFR goal for these indicators.

In terms of faculty quality, the percentage increase in the number of Maryland faculty members holding membership in one of the national academies exceeds its' peers average. In addition, College Park exceeds its peers' average surpassing UC Berkeley and Michigan in the number of invention disclosures per $100 million in total R&D expenditures. In preparing teacher candidates, the university reports a pass rate of 95 percent.

The Institution's Response

The university notes that comparing its performance against 'aspirational peers' which consists of some of the best public universities in the U.S., reflects the eminence College Park is striving to achieve. Although the university is not performing at the level of its peers on all indicators, UMCP is steadily gaining ground on its peers, and on some measures have surpassed them. Of the sixteen indicators, the university leads this eminent group of peers on three measures: percentage of African American of all undergraduates; average percentage growth in federal research and development (R&D) expenditures; and percentage change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies.

To improve the alumni-giving rate, the university contends that by 2004, rapid growth in the number of annual alumni donors will lead to an increase in the alumni-giving rate and the MFR goal will be achieved.

UMCP does recognize that in key areas, such as retention and graduation, more needs to be done. The university has undertaken a number of initiatives/efforts to improve graduation and retention. These initiatives are aimed primarily at the overall undergraduate population with, in some instance, particular influence on minority undergraduate students populations expected. Examples include: creating more living/learning programs designed to make the "big campus" small and engage students more fully in the educational process; fully implementing a Web-based degree credit system to improve student advising systems; and developing proposals through the President's Task Force on Student Success to increase graduation rates. College Park believes that the programs outlined above will not only increase the retention and graduation rate of all undergraduates, but also will increase the retention and graduation rate of African American and other minority students in particular.

University of Maryland, College Park
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th-75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4 yr.) second year retention rate	Six year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six year graduation rate African American	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (1)	Average (3 yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1140-1340	31.1%	14.2%	89.9%	63.5%	55.8%	46.0%	95%	13%	$257,628	$220,007
California, U. of, Berkeley	1200-1410	55.3%	4.7%	95.9%	82.3%	82.9%	61.7%	N/A	18%	389,372	296,100
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1170-1400	57.0%	4.7%	96.6%	78.6%	76.8%	61.6%	N/A	11%	397,361	130,961
Illinois, U. of, Urbana Champaign	1140-1290	25.5%	7.2%	91.9%	75.5%	67.3%	56.9%	N/A	14%	353,676	207,922
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1180-1340	24.4%	8.1%	95.1%	82.2%	71.6%	59.0%	N/A	11%	448,775	197,381
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1140-1360	18.0%	11.1%	93.9%	79.7%	68.7%	60.8%	98%	26%	361,938	144,717
Average of Peers		36.0%	7.2%	94.7%	79.7%	73.9%	60.4%	98%	17%	$290,224	$195,417

University	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 FT faculty (5 yrs.)	UMCP institution-specific indicators: # grad level colleges/pgrms/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member-ships in national academies (2)	# of invention disclosures per $100M in total R&D (3)
Maryland, U. of, College Park	11.3%	4.02	56	19	83%	33
California, U. of, Berkeley	4.9%	7.52	120	107	18%	21
California, U. of, Los Angeles	6.2%	6.21	98	77	20%	32
Illinois, U. of, Urbana Champaign	6.8%	5.44	82	63	6%	29
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	4.9%	5.65	114	93	20%	31
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	3.6%	3.89	67	47	-3%	46
Average of Peers	5.3%	5.76	96	79	13%	32

North Carolina comparisons

	Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
Maryland, U. of, College Park	97.4%	90.1%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	99.4%	[redacted]

Notes:
(1) Comparison of Praxis II scores across institutions is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement, at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.
(2) Average increase in memberships of 3 academies (AAAS, NAE, and NAS), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.
(3) R&D total (Def.) UDES federally financed expenditures in medical science.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

While the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) ranks fourth among its peers for the 25th and 75th percentile of the SAT, the institution exceeds the performance of its peers on a number of indicators. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peers' average. The university's second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rate for all students and the six-year graduation rates for all minorities and for African-Americans exceed the peers' average. It should be noted however, that peer data are missing on many of these indicators.

In terms of faculty and research efforts, UMES ranks first among its peers in the average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures, second in total research and development expenditures per full-time faculty, and third in total research and development expenditures from federal, state, and other sources. In all instances, the university is well above the average of its peers on these indicators.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, UMES is below average in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the college. The institution reports a satisfaction rate of 95 percent, which is below the UNC system average of 97.5 percent. In terms of teacher preparation, the institution reports a passing rate of 59 percent on the Praxis II examination.

The university added three institution specific indicators: the graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below; the graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of less than $30,000; and the percent of all students passing all certification examinations. These indicators provide a measure of the university's effectiveness in graduating students from different socio-economic backgrounds. UMES' performance on all three indicators exceeds its peers' average yet data are not provided for most of the peer institutions.

Among several indicators, it is difficult to compare the university's performance relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example, the university has a low alumni-giving rate (2.1 percent) yet data are not available for any of its peers. Furthermore, historical data on employer satisfaction are not provided in the MFR, which makes it difficult to assess the university's past performance on this indicator.

The Institution's Response

To improve employers' satisfaction with the university's graduates, UMES has formed discipline-specific advisory boards, which assist the appropriate academic departments in the development of curricula to ensure compatibility with the demands of industry and graduate/professional schools. These boards are composed of individuals from the business community and other educational institutions, many of which are employers and/or potential employers of graduates of the institution.

In addition to the employers' satisfaction survey coordinated by the University System of Maryland, UMES conducts its own survey with the employers of its graduates every

three years. The results of these surveys are used to develop curricula and support services. The survey includes questions concerning knowledge of discipline, the ability to engage new situations, work habits, ability to work with others as well as independently, and critical thinking skills.

To improve the collection of peer data on performance indicators, the university is in contact with the appropriate offices of its peer institutions and has made requests for information. However, much of the data requested was either not available or not collected in a format compatible for peer comparison.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Peer Performance Data

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on Praxis II exam (A)	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	740/950	82.2%	79.3%	74.0%	49.1%	49.9%	49.7%	59%	2.1%	$2,508
Alcorn State U	ACT 15-19	96.3%	96.2%	72.0%	45.1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,223
Eastern New Mexico U., Main	ACT 17-23	32.6%	3.8%	58.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Fort Valley State U	N/A	93.6%	93.0%	77.0%	43.7%	N/A	N/A	77%	N/A	2,937
Kentucky State U	ACT 17-22	61.3%	59.2%	63.0%	32.7%	37.4%	37.9%	58%	N/A	713
Lincoln U (PA)	N/A	93.7%	93.3%	68.0%	46.3%	45.5%	45.7%	N/A	N/A	972
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	920-1030	44.5%	17.6%	70.0%	52.5%	47.8%	55.0%	N/A	N/A	0
Western New Mexico U	ACT 16	48.2%	1.9%	51.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Average of Peers		**67.5%**	**52.4%**	**65.6%**	**44.1%**	**43.6%**	**46.2%**	**68%**	**N/A**	**$1,406**

University	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5 yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	UMES institution-specific indicators: Graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below (19 SAT)	UMES institution-specific indicators: Graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of $30,000 or below	UMES institution-specific indicators: % of students passing all certification examinations
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	$26,400	24.5%	37%	33%	81%
Alcorn State U	47,482	14.4%	32%	30%	N/A
Eastern New Mexico U., Main	0	0.0%	N/A	N/A	80%
Fort Valley State U	N/A	-2.1%	19%	17%	76%
Kentucky State U	N/A	-14.7%	16%	15%	N/A
Lincoln U (PA)	15,886	18.5%	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	0	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Western New Mexico U	0	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average of Peers	**$12,274**	**2.3%**	**22%**	**21%**	**78%**

North Carolina comparisons

	Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
UMES	95%	87%
Western Carolina State U	96.3%	
Appalachian State U	99.0%	
Fayetteville State U	98.3%	
North Carolina A&T U	96.3%	
North Carolina Central U	94.7%	
UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Average	97.5%	

Notes:
N/A = Data not available
(A) Comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times in a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement, at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Maryland University College

There are very few peer indicators for the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) due to the unique nature of this institution. For example, the majority of students attending UMUC attend part-time which reflects the university's target population: working adults. In addition, the university's indicators reflect other unique characteristics such as the university's goal to serve students through distance education. Therefore, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen.

Overall, the university compares favorably to its peers. The university's performance on alumni giving is equal to the peers' average. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peers' average. However, the university is below its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. According to the MFR however, the university has made progress on this measure. The percentage of minority undergraduates has increased from 37 percent in 1998 to 42 percent in 2000. Furthermore, UMUC is well on its way to achieving its goal of 43 percent.

Compared to the University of North Carolina System institutions, UMUC is well above average of its peers in the proportion of employers who would hire another graduate from the college. The institution reports a 100 percent satisfaction rate.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators: the percentage of African-American graduates in information technology; the percentage of undergraduates students over the age of 25; the number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business; the number of worldwide online courses; and the number of worldwide online enrollments. The university exceeds the performance of its peers on all of these indicators. Unique among these institution-specific indicators is the number of worldwide online courses and enrollments. According to the MFR, enrollments in these areas has increased significantly; over 500 percent in four years.

Among several indicators, it is difficult to compare the university's performance relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example for alumni giving, peer data are not provided for five of the peer institutions. Although the university has the highest performance on the number of online courses and enrollments, peer data are not provided for most of the peer institutions.

The Institution's Response

There are two types of measures for which the institution is missing data. In some cases, institutions did not have their data included in the IPEDS national databases (e.g. degree completion). Hopefully, this was a one-time incident, since by and large, all higher educational institutions are required to provide NCES with certain data sets. In the future, UMUC will substitute older (but available) data in those instances where the institution's most recent information is not yet available in the national databases.

UMUC will also contact its peer institutions for 'unofficial' counts and note it in their report.

The second type of missing data focuses on information that is not readily available in national databases but which are central to its mission – e.g. online courses and enrollments. In these instances, UMUC is dependent on the good will of the peer institutions. UMUC is fully committed to getting as much data as it can from the peers. The university believes that as it builds relationships with those ten institutions, it will receive more cooperation from them and be in a position to provide data for more peer institutions than it was able to do this year.

In addition, UMUC plans to continue to explore the possibility of adding data from other institutions, public and private, whose focus is distance education. The university believes that data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) through the Distance Education Demonstration Project would be ideal however at this time, USDE is not releasing the data until it finalizes its report to Congress.

University of Maryland University College
Peer Performance Data

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Alumni giving rate	UMUC institution-specific indicators: # of African-American IT graduates*	% of undergraduates 25 and older**	# of post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.	Number of worldwide online courses	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
Maryland, U. of, University College	42.1%	30.3%	5.7%	134	84.5%	735	382	62,686
Arkansas, U. of, Little Rock	N/A	N/A	2.8%	2	N/A	110	22	195
California State U., Dominguez Hills	71.1%	29.7%	1.2%	3	57.1%	192	N/A	N/A
Central Connecticut State U.	16.3%	7.5%	N/A	N/A	28.2%	44	3	49
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	64.2%	21.6%	5.4%	68	38.1%	569	N/A	N/A
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	86.0%	37.6%	N/A	35	55.3%	22	10	250
CUNY Hunter C.	56.1%	19.8%	12.3%	4	37.4%	N/A	N/A	N/A
CUNY Queens C.	42.3%	10.5%	N/A	7	38.3%	76	N/A	N/A
Governors State U.	33.7%	27.7%	N/A	15	69.5%	58	0	0
Massachusetts, U. of, Boston	27.0%	12.2%	N/A	N/A	48.0%	158	N/A	N/A
North Florida, U. of	19.1%	9.9%	6.8%	8	33.3%	162	22	414
Average of Peers	**46.2%**	**19.6%**	**5.7%**	**18**	**45.0%**	**155**	**11**	**182**

University	North Carolina comparisons: Employers' satisfaction	Graduates' satisfaction
UMUC	100%	93%
Western Carolina State U.	96.3%	
Appalachian State U.	99.0%	
Fayetteville State U.	98.3%	
North Carolina A&T U.	96.3%	
North Carolina Central U.	94.7%	
UNC - Charlotte	97.8%	
UNC - Pembroke	98.7%	
UNC - Wilmington	99.0%	
Average	**97.5%**	

Notes:
N/A - Data not available
* Bachelor's degrees
** Proxy for median age of bachelor's recipients, which is not available for peers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Morgan State University

Morgan State University exceeds the performance of its peers on the majority of its indicators. The university's second-year retention rate for minority and African-American students as well as the six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students are well above the peers' average. In addition, Morgan has had a substantial increase in the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded which reflects the university's goal of increasing the number of graduate degrees awarded to African-Americans. The tendency for Morgan graduates to enroll in graduate and professional schools is above its peers' average and well above the statewide average. Furthermore, Morgan has had a substantial increase in research grant and contract activity over the last decade.

The university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Morgan has next to the lowest second-year retention rate for all students and this rate is well below the peers' average. In addition, the six-year graduation rate for all students is slightly below the peers' average. In terms of the institution's effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates, the passage rate on the Praxis II is 73 percent. It should be noted however, that five of Morgan's peer institutions do not administer this exam. Furthermore, the Praxis II examination is not an indicator used in Morgan's MFR.

Morgan graduates tend to be very satisfied with the preparation they received for graduate school or employment. Approximately 97 percent of undergraduate alumni expressed satisfaction with the way in which Morgan has prepared them for advanced degree programs. In addition, 96 percent of undergraduate alumni expressed satisfaction with the way the institution prepared them for employment. In both cases, Morgan's performance exceeds the performance of its peers on these indicators. However, it should be noted that only two of its peer institutions collect these data. To compensate for these missing data, Morgan compared its performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification. On both of these indicators, Morgan's performance is slightly below the statewide average. However according to the MFR, Morgan's performance on both indicators has improved.

In many cases, it is difficult to compare the performance of Morgan relative to its peers due to the large number of missing data. For example, data for the alumni-giving category are not available for four of its peers. Among those indicators where Morgan has the highest performance (i.e. second-year for all minorities and African-Americans) data are missing from at least four institutions. In addition, North Carolina A&T State University is the only peer institution that provides data on employer satisfaction. Furthermore, although Morgan's alumni-giving rate is above its peers' average, data are not available for four of its peer institutions.

The Institution's Response

The university has been diligent in its efforts to acquire peer data and plans to continue to seek other possible data sources. Furthermore, Morgan kept the Commission informed of the difficulties it experienced in obtaining certain peer data. This was a problem other campuses faced as well. In particular, the four performance measures consistently not

collected by most of Morgan's peer institutions are graduate or professional school-going rate, satisfaction with advanced studies preparation, satisfaction with job preparation, and employer satisfaction. It should be noted that Morgan has no authority to ask the peer institutions to collect data for institutional use.

Morgan is committed to improving retention and graduation rates. The university's comprehensive, campus-wide retention committee monitors appropriate policies and practices and makes recommendations for change, where relevant, to improve student persistence. The university plans to continue to work toward a lower student-faculty ratio. It also continues to seek additional aid through grants and changes in state programs.

Morgan State University
Peer Performance Data

University	Second-year retention rate	Second-year retention rate African-American	Second-year minority retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate African American	Six-year minority graduation rate	% increase in doctoral degrees over	Graduate/prof school-going rate[1]	Satisfaction with adv studies preparation[1]	Satisfaction with job preparation[1]	PRAXIS II pass rate[2]	Employer satisfaction[1]	Alumni giving	% growth in grants & contracts (research)[3]
Morgan State University	72%	71%	74%	41%	42%	42%	120%	48%	97%	96%	71%	100%	10%	321%
University of Alabama - Huntsville	74%	86%	81%	35%	18%	19%	6%	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected	Test not used	Not collected	7%	31%
Florida A & M University	87%	Not collected	Not collected	44%	44%	44%	900%	No response	No response	No response	Test not used	No response not available		162%
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	79%	81%	76%	44%	21%	21%	0%	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected	Test not used	Not collected	23%	60%
University of Massachusetts Lowell	74%	67%	71%	43%	22%	22%	18%	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected		96%	Not collected not available	178%
Michigan Technological University	86%	89% (17/27)	86%	67%	43%	45%	27%	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected		100%	Not collected	19%
Oakland University	74%	Number too small	67%	40%	26%	33%	58%	14%	Not collected	Not collected	Test not used	Not collected	13%	66%
Jackson State University	77%	Not collected[4]		31%	31%	31%	44%	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected		100%	Not collected not available	191%
The College of New Jersey	91%	Not collected	Not collected	78%	Not collected	Not collected	--	98%	Not collected	Not collected		98%	Not collected	10%
City University of New York City College	74%	Not collected	Not collected	23%	Not collected	Not collected	--	Not collected	Not collected	Not collected	Test not used	Not collected	8%	-6%
North Carolina A & T State University	72%	Not collected[5]		42%	41%	41%	-60%	25%	50%	81%	64%	96%	6%	19%
Tennessee State University	78%	Not collected	Not collected	38%	40%	40%	-27%	Not collected	Not collected	See note 6		97%	Not collected not available	234%
Texas A & M University - Kingsville	61%	47%	61%	21%	12%	21%	9%	Not collected	84%	91%	81%	Not collected	5%	118%
Peer Average	77%	70%	71%	42%	30%	32%	64%	46%	70%	86%	91%	96%	11%	201%

Maryland Institutions in Morgan State's Carnegie Classification				
Bowie State University	32%	96%	95%	
Frostburg State University	25%	96%	97%	
Salisbury University	27%	98%	98%	
Towson University	23%	99%	96%	
University of Baltimore	21%	100%	99%	
University of Maryland University College	21%	100%	97%	
State's Carnegie Classification Average	25%	98%	97%	

Notes

***In some institutions, the African American and overall minority populations are small. Please exercise care should when interpreting the retention and graduation rates for these categories of students.**

In addition, please be aware that in some institutions, the minority population is overwhelmingly made up by one racial group, African Americans or Hispanic Americans.

[1] FY 1999 degree recipients for Morgan State University and Maryland institutions, most current for peer institutions, where available

[2] Comparison of pass rates across state lines is not advisable. Depending on institutional requirements, the exam may be required at different times on a student's education. At some institutions, Praxis II is a graduation requirement; at other institutions it is not. Because of these institutional differences, comparison of Praxis II passing rates across institutions may not be valid.

[3] Spring 2001 for Morgan State University, most current data for other institutions, where available

[4] Base year was FY 1998, current year was FY 1999

[5] Oakland excluded Asian American students because their retention rate was above the norm

[6] As reported by the institution's Placement Office, may include persons attending graduate school as well as those who intend to attend

[7] Institution's undergraduate population is 99% African American

[8] Institution's undergraduate population is over 40% African Americans

[9] The institution's questions gauges the degree to which the alumni's education added to "Practice skills necessary to obtain employment in your field?" Eighty-seven percent of the respondents (who graduated in 1997/98 noted "somewhat" or "very much." This item is not comparable to the item used by Morgan and the rest of the other Maryland public four years institutions. This is the reason for not reporting the peer institution's response in the table.

[10] Average of retention rates for the Fall 1991, 1992, and 1993 cohorts

[11] Average of graduation rates for the Fall 1992, 1993, and 1994 cohorts

Office of Institutional Research
Prepared by the Division of Planning and Information Technology

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendices

A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers

The process of selecting peers involved narrowing a long list of colleges and universities (approximately 3,600) to a medium-sized list (fewer than 250), then to a small group with key characteristics like those of the 'home' institution (between 22 and 60). The institutions in the smaller group are termed funding peers. Ultimately, USM institutions were asked to choose 10 performance peers from their lists.

The narrowing process proceeded as follows:

1. Only public universities were considered.
2. Institutions were categorized by Carnegie classification.
3. Six sets of variables were mathematically analyzed for each institution. Examples of these variables include:
   - Size
   - Student mix
   - Non-state revenues
   - Program mix
   - Location (urban vs. rural)

The analysis aimed to provide a comparatively short list of institutions, which are most like each USM institution. From the narrowed list, each USM institution then selected 10 performance peers based on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives.

Below is a list of top criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

Bowie

- SATs and/or ACT profiles
- Academic mission
- Types of programs
- General academic reputation
- Comparable student communities served

Coppin

- Program mix, especially teacher preparation
- Size
- Geographic location

Frostburg

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Size
- Program mix
- Geographic location

Salisbury

- Size
- Program mix
- Mission

Towson

- Size
- Student mix
- Geographic location

University of Baltimore

- Program mix
- Size
- Urban setting

University of Maryland Baltimore County

- Size
- Mission, emphasis on science and technology
- Minority mix
- Exclusion of institutions with medical schools

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Program mix
- Minority mix

University of Maryland University College

- Percentage of students over the age of 25
- Institution ranking
- Type of delivery formats used – especially on-line distance education programs

B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	SAT score 25th/75th %ile	Peer institutions	For all incoming freshmen, composite SAT score. For peer institutions whose student primarily report ACT scores, ACT scores reported but not converted.	Fall 1999
2	% Minorities of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 1999
3	% African-American of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 1999
4	Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2001 edition	The percentage of first-year freshmen that returned to the same college or university the following fall, averaged over the first-year classes entering between 1995 and 1998.	Data on web site: February, 2001
5	Six-year graduation rate	Peer institutions from IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who earned a bachelor's degree within six years at the institution at which they first enrolled. Initial cohort (line 10)/completers of bachelor's degrees, total (line 18)	1999 (1993 cohort)
6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	Peer institutions from IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race. Same calculation as for item 7.	1999 (1993 cohort)
7	Six-year graduation rate: African-Americans	Peer institutions from IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey	Self-explanatory. Same calculation as for item 7.	1999 (1993 cohort)

B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
8	Passing rate on Praxis II exam	Peer institutions	Number of undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who passed Praxis II (or NTE if applicable) divided by the number of undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who took Praxis II.	2000 graduates
9	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	Number of BSN graduates in the Class of 2000 who pass the NCLEX examination on the first attempt divided by the number of graduates who took the exam.	2000 graduates
10	Passing rates in other licensure exams			
10a	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2002 edition	Percentage of 1999 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 1999 and February 2000 and passed on their first attempt. Pass rates are reported only for the jurisdiction in which the school had the largest number of first-time takers.	1999 graduates
10b	Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	Number of pharmacy graduates in the Class of 2000 who passed the NAPLEX on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2000 graduates
10c	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 1999 divided by number of graduates who took the exam. For FSU: number of BSW graduates in the Class of 2000 who passed the LCSW examination on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	1999 2000 graduates
10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2000 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2000 divided by number of graduates from Dental School Class of 2000.	2000 graduates
10e	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Number who pass the 2000 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2000

B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
11	Graduates' satisfaction	USM Survey of Graduates & Employers, 2001	Percentage of graduating seniors indicating that if they could start college again, they would attend the same institution. (On question 15, number of persons responding 1 or 2 divided by number responding 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5.)	2001
12	Employers' satisfaction	USM Survey of Graduates & Employers, 2001;UNC 1999 Employer Survey	Percentage of employers that would hire another graduate from the same institution. (On question 4, number of persons responding 1 or 2 divided by number responding 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5.)	2001
13	Alumni giving rate *OR*	Council for Aid to Education, 2000 Voluntary Support of Education	Alumni donors as a percentage of alumni solicited (Definition and source used by all institutions except UMCP & FSU and their peers)	2000
	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2001 edition	Average percent of undergraduate alumni of record who donated money to the institution. Alumni of record are former full- or part-time students with an undergraduate degree for whom the institution has a current address. Undergraduate alumni donors made one or more gifts for either current operations or capital expenses during the specified academic year. The alumni giving rate is the number of appropriate donors during a given year divided by the number of appropriate alumni of record. The rates were averaged for 1998 and 1999. (Definition and source used by UMCP & FSU and their peers.)	1998-1999
14	Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB.	FY99

B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
15	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D $), AAUP or NCES, Fall Staff Survey (faculty counts)	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts for institutions other than UMB. For UMB, faculty are full-time faculty whose assignments are for instruction, research, or public service and include medical faculty and administrative officers whose principal activity is instruction, research, or public service. For UMB, faculty counts are taken from NCES, Fall Staff Survey.	FY99
16	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY94 through FY99. Excludes federally financed expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB.	FY94 - FY99
17	Number of faculty awards per 100 faculty (5 yrs.)	USM data base (built from national publications and databases)	The total number of awards per 100 full-time instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor over the 5-year period from 1997 through 2001. Awards counted: Fulbrights, Guggenheims, NEH fellowships, CAREER (Young Investigator) awards, Sloan fellowships. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts.	1997 - 2001

B. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
Bowie State University				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2000-2001	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 1999
2	Acceptance rate	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2000-2001	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 1999
3	Yield rate	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2000-2001	Percentage of freshman applicants who enrolled	Fall 1999
4	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation and IPEDS	Average dollars spent on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per core faculty (full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty)	FY 1999
Coppin State College				
1	% part-time undergraduates of total undergraduate enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 1999	Self-explanatory	Fall 1999
2	% graduate students of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 1999	Self-explanatory	Fall 1999
3	Unrestricted non-auxiliary funds as % of total funds	IPEDS, Finance Survey, FY99	Total unrestricted current funds revenues minus unrestricted revenues from auxiliary enterprises divided by total unrestricted current funds revenues	FY 1999
4	Average age full-time undergraduate	College home page CollegeEdge.com	Self-explanatory	1999-2000

B. University System Of Maryland Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
Frostburg State University				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 1999 and AAUP	Self-explanatory	Fall 1999
2	E&G expenditure per degree awarded	IPEDS, GRS and Finance Survey	E&G expenditure/number of graduates	FY 2000
Salisbury University				
1	Acceptance rate	*U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2001 edition*	The ratio of admitted first-time, first-year, degree-seeking students to total applicants. Total applicants include students who meet all requirements to be considered for admission AND who were notified of an admission decision.	Fall 1999
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	*U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2001 edition*	The percentage of full-time faculty (both tenured/tenure-track and contractual) who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	Fall 1999
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	*IPEDS Peer Analysis System*	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty. Both numbers are calculated values: FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount. FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey, and FTEF is derived from the Fall Staff Survey.	Fall 1999
4	Average high school GPA	*U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2001 edition*	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 1999
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	*IPEDS Peer Analysis System*	Unrestricted state appropriation divided by FTES. Unrestricted state appropriation is from the Finance Survey, and FTES from the Fall Enrollment Survey.	FY 1999 Fall 1998

B. University System Of Maryland Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
Towson University				
1	Average high school GPA	Common Data Set 1999 (C12)	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted GPA	Fall 1999
2	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	Common Data Set 1999 (F1)	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 1999 who live in college-owned, -operated, or affiliated housing	Fall 1999
3	Student-to-faculty ratio	Common Data Set 1999 (I2)	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent instructional faculty. Undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants are not counted as faculty.	Fall 1999
4	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News & World Report	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the number of freshmen admitted	Fall 1999
University of Baltimore				
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, Part B, line 2	Total dollars expended for research	FY 1999
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Fall Staff, lines 22 and 77	Percentage of faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 1999
University of Maryland, Baltimore				
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC		
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC		
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC		

B. University System Of Maryland Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
4	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 1999
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional	
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	
University of Maryland Baltimore County				
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY2000 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science, Computer Engineering; Electrical, Electronics & Communication.	FY 2000
2	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to $million R&D expenditures	AUTM, National Science Foundation	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. Number of invention disclosures, no matter how comprehensive, counted by institution (AUTM) divided by $million in R&D expenditures (NSF) from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources	FY 2000
3	Ratio of FTE students/ FT faculty	IPEDS Enrollment Files, AAUP	Ratio of FTE students (FT + 1/3 PT) to FT faculty (per AAUP based on categories of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor) for Fall 1999.	Fall 1999

B. University System Of Maryland Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
University of Maryland, College Park				
1	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation	National Research Council, *U.S. News*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Financial Times*, *Business Week*, *Success*	Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation by one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 25 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.	Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area
2	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation	National Research Council, *U.S. News*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Financial Times*, *Business Week*, *Success*	Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation in one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 15 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.	Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area
3	% change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies	USM database	The percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and National Academy of Sciences), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.	1997-2001
4	Number of invention disclosures per $100M in R&D	Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), National Science Foundation (NSF)	The number of invention disclosures reported by the institution to AUTM, per each $100 million in TOTAL research and development (R&D) expenditures reported for the institution by NSF.	Fall 1999

B. University System Of Maryland Institution-Specific Peer Performance Measures (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
University of Maryland Eastern Shore				
1	Graduation rates of educationally disadvantaged students	Peers institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with SAT scores of 900 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 1999
2	Graduation rates of economically disadvantaged students	Peer institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with family incomes of $30,000 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 1999
3	Average passing rates on <u>all</u> certification examinations	Peer institutions	Percent of student passing <u>all</u> certification examinations given at the University	Fall 1999
University of Maryland University College				
1	Number of African-Americans of all IT graduates	MAITI report for UMUC; IPEDS completion data for peer institutions	Number of graduates of IT (MAITI) undergraduate programs who are African-American. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), and electrical engineering (CIP 14.10).	FY 2000
2	% of undergraduate students who are 25 and older	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Percent of undergraduate students who are older than 25 years of age	Fall 1999
3	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields	IPEDS, Completions survey	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204)	FY 2000
4	Number of worldwide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2001
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2001

C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Second year retention rate	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) – Enrollment Information System (EIS), Degree Information System (DIS). US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort
2	Second year retention rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort
3	Second year retention rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	*In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.* The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort
4	Six year graduation rate	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1993 Cohort
5	Six year graduation rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1993 Cohort

C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
6	Six year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	*In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.* The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1993 Cohort
7	Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS. IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions.	Self-explanatory	
8	Graduate/Professional school going rate	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation. *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 1999 bachelor's degree recipients
9	Student satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation and who rated their preparation for advanced education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 1999 bachelor's degree recipients
10	Student satisfaction with job preparation.	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients employed full-time within one year of graduation and who rated their education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 1999 bachelor's degree recipients

C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators (Continued)

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
11	PRAXIS II pass rate	HEA Title II: Aggregate and Summary Institution- Level Pass Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program. Peer Institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the State for licensure and the total pass rate. *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	1999-2000 academic year
12	Employer satisfaction	MSU Survey Employers. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Average of nine dimensions of employers' rating of satisfaction with Morgan alumni. *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 1999 bachelor's degree recipients
13	Alumni giving	MSU Development Office. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Percent of Morgan's graduates who made contributions to the University during a fiscal year. The base for deriving the percentage is the total number of Morgan graduates for whom *good* contact information is available *Appropriate Maryland institutions* refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Most current data available
14	Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of FY1990	MSU Budget Office. IPEDS Peer institutions.	Self-explanatory	

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").